

The Council re-assembled at the Council Chamber, Fort St. George, at 11 a.m. on Thursday the 16th March 1922, the hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir P. RAJAGOPALA ACHARIYAR AVargal, K.C.S.I., C.I.E., President, presiding.

## I

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

[Order made by the President of the Madras Legislative Council under Standing Order No. 15—

(1) Printed copies of the questions and answers to be put and given at a meeting of the Council shall be placed on the Council table an hour before the President takes his seat.

(2) The questions shall be put and answered in the following manner :—

The Secretary shall call the name of each interpellator in alphabetical order, specify the serial numbers of his questions and make a sufficient pause to allow him or any other member a reasonable opportunity of rising in his place if he is desirous of asking a supplementary question. Supplementary questions must be put immediately after the principal questions to which they relate.]

*Communal representation in the Engineering staff of certain district boards.*

1371 Q.—Munshi MUHAMMAD ABUR-RAHMAN SAHIB: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state the number of—

(a) Engineers and assistant engineers, and

(b) Overseers and sub-overseers,

in active service under the district boards of Ganjam, Vizagapatam, Gōdāvari, Kistna, Guntūr, Nellore and Chittoor, as it stood on 31st December 1921 under the following classes :—

(a) Brahmins,

(b) Muhammadans,

(c) Christians, and

(d) other non-Brahmins?

A.—The Quarterly Civil List for Madras corrected up to the 1st January 1922 contains the names of the engineers and the assistant engineers employed under the several district boards. The Government have no further information.

*Report of Mr. Martin regarding forest exploitation.*

1372 Q.—Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state whether in connexion with the report made by Mr. Martin in respect of forest exploitation—

(a) any money was spent as capital expenditure;

(b) and if so, how much up to the date of his report;

(c) whether any further money was spent after his report; if any money has been spent before or after his report, whether the same is covered by any specified items of budget grant made in 1921–22 and sanctioned by the Legislative Council;

(d) if they are not covered by any specified items, from what sources the funds were drawn; and

(e) whether any portion of the money spent in connexion with Mr. Martin's investigation was spent before 1st April 1921?

[16th March 1922]

4.—(a) & (b) It is presumed that the report of Mr. Martin alluded to is that submitted by him on 26th May 1921. No capital expenditure has been incurred in connexion with that report.

(c) & (d) The following expenditure has been incurred up to date on the exploitation of the Chenai Nair forests:—

	RS.
1919-20 .. .. .	15,900
1920-21 .. .. .	1,54,300
1921-22 (first nine months) .. .	1,55,200

The above expenditure is included in the sanctioned budget grants of the years to which the figures relate and took place in pursuance of administrative approval given in G.O. No. 2189, Revenue (Special), dated 27th November 1919.

(e) The cost of Mr. Martin's investigations consisted of his pay and allowances and incidental expenses during his tours in this Presidency. No portion of these charges was borne by this Government prior to 1st April 1921.

## II

### A BILL TO AMEND THE MADRAS PROPRIETARY ESTATES' VILLAGE SERVICE ACT, 1894, AND THE HEREDITARY VILLAGE OFFICES ACT, 1895

#### CLAUSE 3—*cont.*

The consideration of the Bill to amend the Madras Proprietary Estates' Village Service Act, 1894, and the Hereditary Village Offices Act, 1895, was then resumed.

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—“ Sir, now discretion is given to district collectors to dismiss or remove a village officer. The words used are, the district collector ‘may’ dismiss or remove. From this it is clear that the district collector is given discretion. It is not obligatory on his part to dismiss him. From this I am of opinion that the words ‘except for a cause which the district collector in his discretion accepts as satisfactory’ are a mere surplusage. Now the object of section 4 of the Bill is to reduce the period of time allowed for an appeal and the object of section 5 is to remove the right of inheritance. The district collector and not sub-collectors are to deal with these cases. These are the only things contemplated. When the principal Act as well as this Act is in force in any particular area, a dismissal under the principal Act or under this Act must be distinguished, because under section 5, the words used are : ‘on such dismissal or removal, the hereditary right to the office shall, unless the collector otherwise directs, cease.’ Unless we are able to distinguish one kind of dismissal from another kind of dismissal as contemplated by this Bill, I do not think the purpose as contemplated by the new Bill can be given effect to. What is it that distinguishes a removal from dismissal under the provisions of the principal Act as compared with the provisions contained in the new Bill? Therefore in order to distinguish one removal from another, it is necessary that we should characterize a dismissal under the particular circumstances as distinguished from the other. Therefore a clause such as : a removal or dismissal on account of any neglect or resignation in consequence of any